

**United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Criminal Investigation Division  
Investigative Activity Report**

**Case Number**

0600-0539

**Case Title:**

Team, Inc.

**Reporting Office:**

Dallas, TX, Area Office

**Subject of Report:**

Interview

**Activity Date:**

May 6, 2010

**Reporting Official and Date:**

, SA

28-MAY-2010, Signed by , SA

**Approving Official and Date:**

, SAC

31-MAY-2010, Approved by , ASAC

**SYNOPSIS**

05/06/2010 - confessed to falsifying emissions monitoring data and alleged that multiple people were involved, including Team management at the Borger, Texas office. asserted that, at one time, nearly half of all tests were falsified. described in detail how and others tampered with the monitoring equipment to produce fictitious results.

acknowledged that was aware of the potential penalties associated with actions.

**DETAILS**

On 05/06/2010, at approximately 1900 hours, Special Agents and interviewed in the parking lot of the for Team Industrial Services (Team) in Borger Texas. and introduced themselves via credentials; voluntarily provided the following information:

said began working for Team in attended Team ECS training in Houston, Texas after successful completion of the training program, started performing LDAR monitoring at , and several other facilities in the Borger area. , along with primarily worked on the road, based out of the Team office on Florida Street in Borger.

recalled that and graduated first and second, respectively, from the Team training in Houston. stated that first supervisor at Team was who was eventually replaced by

said that although felt overworked, never felt unsafe. opined there was always pressure from management to monitor as many components per day as possible. recalled typically being assigned 500 to 600 components each per day.

said could legitimately monitor 300-350 components per day, depending on the size of the components and the layout of the facility. s stated that if all of the assigned components could not be monitored in one day would have to complete the remainder the following day.

s stated that , the , was responsible for assigning and tracking the components checked by . Aside from feeling overworked recalled having problems with monitoring equipment being functional. said the "TVAs"

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.  
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;  
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Criminal Investigation Division  
Investigative Activity Report**

**Case Number**

0600-0539

were all ways breaking down and required constant repair.

When asked about “punching-in” [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] was aware it was a form of “pencil whipping,” but [REDACTED] had never done it. [REDACTED] added that Team’s internal audits combined with refinery oversight and state follow up would have made it difficult to get away with. Additionally; [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] informed everyone that EPA would arrest them if they were caught “punching-in,” citing arrests in California and Washington.

[REDACTED] cited a personality conflict with [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] reason for leaving Team in [REDACTED]

Approximately midway through the interview [REDACTED] covered [REDACTED] face with [REDACTED] hands and asserted that people were “punching-in.” [REDACTED] stated that it came from those “above training those below.”

[REDACTED] described “punching-in” as: performing “monitoring” from inside an office or the cabin of a vehicle, in lieu of actually monitoring facility components. [REDACTED] said one method [REDACTED] and others, used was to “monitor” emissions from a “black” magic marker for the purpose of disguising the falsification of the test. By using the marker the monitoring instrument would read as if a component was being measured for volatile emissions. The fumes from the marker made it appear that the component was within required parameters. [REDACTED] said in order to get slight variances in the false readings [REDACTED] would hold the marker at various distances from the end of the monitoring instrument. [REDACTED] added that the older monitoring equipment permitted manual manipulation of the monitoring data.

[REDACTED] said when [REDACTED] first started, at [REDACTED]; it happened quite a bit, everyone was punching-in. [REDACTED] added that everyone at the Florida Street office; [REDACTED] [REDACTED] joked about how much they used to do it (punching-in).

[REDACTED] opined that about half the components monitored were punched-in during [REDACTED] first few months with Team.

[REDACTED] described a typical workday as; arriving to work at 0800 hours, standing around talking for an hour or so, taking a very long lunch, doing some punching-in, performing a little bit of legitimate monitoring and then leaving for the day. [REDACTED] said the entire office knew what was happening, adding that everyone would joke about how easy the job was.

[REDACTED] said after a while Team management started to “crack down” on punching-in, telling people they would go to jail if they got caught. [REDACTED] said Team management told technicians not to punch-in, but put pressure on them to monitor an unreasonable number of components each day. [REDACTED] said after the crack down people were still punching-in but to a lesser extent.

[REDACTED] stated that Team management gave mixed signals, pressuring technicians to get the required number of components monitored. [REDACTED] recalled telephoning the office to inform management that [REDACTED] would not be able to complete his assigned components; [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] didn’t care what [REDACTED] did as long as [REDACTED] got the numbers done.

[REDACTED] recounted a specific incident when [REDACTED] informed Team manager [REDACTED] that [REDACTED]

**United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Criminal Investigation Division  
Investigative Activity Report**

**Case Number**

0600-0539

was not going to be able to complete [REDACTED] assigned number of components. [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] not to worry about it, to go home. The next day, when [REDACTED] arrived at work, the monitoring of the remaining components had somehow been documented as being complete.

[REDACTED] added that previous monitoring dictated how to address component monitoring; explaining that if a component was out of service but was on the schedule to be monitored it (the component) would continue to be monitored so as to not raise suspicion from the refinery. Additionally, if a component was in a location that required a lift from the refinery but a lift was not requested during the previous monitoring the technician would punch-in the data so as to not raise suspicion from the refinery.

[REDACTED] was aware of Team's policy to charge the client per component monitored.

[REDACTED] said [REDACTED] currently works as an [REDACTED] and lives with the [REDACTED]